

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 20, 2008. Applicant has amended claims 14 and 19. Reconsideration and favorable action in this case are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 14 and 19 due to informalities. Applicant has amended the claims 14 and 19 in accordance with the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14, 16-22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,534 to Geiger in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,647,494 to Drews and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,302,487 to Ylonen. Applicants have reviewed these references in detail and do not believe that they disclose or make obvious the invention as claimed.

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 23-27 and 29-31 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten into independent form.

Applicants understand the position of the Examiner to be as follows: (1) Geiger shows the steps of accessing a certificate bound to a processing device and authenticating the certificate, but does not show the steps of reading configuration parameters from the certificate, if properly authenticated, or configuring the processing device responsive to the configuration parameters; (2) Drew discloses reading configuration parameters from the certificate, if properly authenticated, and configuring the hardware responsive to the configuration parameters, but does not show setting one or more of (a) a speed of a hardware component of the processing device, (b) access to one or more otherwise inaccessible memory locations or (c) enablement or disablement of a hardware component.

Ylonen is used by the Examiner to show enablement or disablement of a hardware component, and hence would show the step of "configuring the processing device hardware responsive to the configuration parameters to set one or more of: a speed of a

hardware component of the processing device, access to one or more otherwise inaccessible memory locations or enablement or disablement of a hardware component”.

In support of this interpretation of Ylonen, the Examiner cites the following passage from Ylonen at column 5, lines 53-65, although this passage is not used in the rejection of claim 1:

Preferably, a hardware token such as a smart card removably attachable to the network device using the hardware token reader of the network device contains at least the following information:
a private key for the network device for authentication purposes,
a certificate or a public key corresponding to the private key,
certificate of a management system allowed to control the network device in order to allow the network device to authenticate any messages from the management system...”

As described in Ylonen, the management system is used to generate configuration data on a hardware token, such as a smart card. The hardware token is taken to other network devices to configure those devices in accordance with the configuration data. Each network device, therefore, must have a hardware token reader. The passage cited by the Examiner states what is contained in the hardware token: (1) a private key, (2) a certificate or public key corresponding to the private key and (3) a certificate of a management system allowed to control the network device. These requirements all data on the hardware token. Nothing in this passage indicates the enablement or disablement of a hardware component. There is nothing in Ylonen that suggests that any hardware component isn't fully functional at all times, including the hardware token.

With regard to the specific passages cited by the Examiner, Applicants have reviewed the Ylonen reference carefully and do not believe that Ylonen shows setting a configuration parameters as recited in the claim and referenced above. The Examiner specifically cited column 17, lines 25-40, along with Figure 4B (reference numeral 440) and Figure 5 (reference numeral 558).

The text cited by the Examiner does not specify any particular configuration parameter. Step 440 (from Figure 4A) cited by the Examiner merely recites: “storing 440 said encrypted and digitally signed configuration information in a memory means accessible to a distribution entity”. The description of what constitutes “configuration information” is not specified – this step merely stores it somewhere in memory.

Similarly, hardware 558 (from Figure 5) is merely “computer software code means 558 for causing a set of configuration information to be stored in said memory means”. Once again, this only states that the device has a software which stores configuration information in a memory – it does not specify any configuration parameter that comes in the categories set forth in the claims, i.e., the speed of a hardware component of the processing device, access to one or more normally hidden memory locations or the enablement or disablement of a hardware component. There is no indication that the “memory means 530 accessible by the distribution entity” is not otherwise accessible – and in any case, the memory means is not made available by the “configuration information” of Ylonen.

If the Examiner believes that Ylonen shows a hardware component which is disabled responsive to configuration parameters in the hardware token, it would be greatly appreciated if the examiner would specify the hardware component, and how it is disabled or enabled.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that independent claims 1, 6, 12, and 17 are all novel and unobvious over the prior art and respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, including extension fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action,

it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Alan W. Lintel, Applicants' Attorney at (972) 664-9595 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Alan W. Lintel/

Alan W. Lintel
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32478

January 31, 2009
Anderson, Levine & Lintel
14785 Preston Rd.
Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
Tel. (972) 664-9595